Third Member of Council.—Itinerant Courts will not work well.

Dewan.—Not practicable.

SUBJECT No. 78.

Establishment of Village Munsiffs' Courts in each Municipality.

Messrs. Gopalayya, Holalkere Taluk and Phaniyachar, Hosdurga Taluk.

Mr. Gopalayya.—Village Munsiffs' Courts may be established in all Municipal Towns for the disposal of petty suits.

Third Member of Council.—This will be considered.

SUBJECT No. 79.

Improvement of Village Munsiffs' Courts

Messrs. (1) Nadig Bhima Rao, Channagiri Taluk, and S. Sitaramaiya, Shimoga Taluk and (2) G.S. Murigeppa, Gubbi Taluk.

Mr. Sitharamayya.—With the popularity of Village Munsiffs, the work in some Courts has been steadily increasing and cannot be conveniently managed without the help of a clerk. A provision may therefore be made for a clerk on Rs. 10 where the work is heavy.

Third Member of Council.—Government have examined the question. There are 200 Courts and at Rs. 5 or 6 per Court the total expenditure comes to Rs. 10,000 or 12,000. If the concession is shown to one Court, other Courts will also ask for the same. If you are agreeable to pay half the cost, the matter will be considered.

Mr. Sitharamayya.—To create stimulus and earnestness in the Village Munsiffs, such of them as have worked satisfactorily may be given an honorarium.

Mr. C. Srinivasa Rao.—Honorary work should never be paid for.

Third Member of Council.—Not desirable.

SUBJECT No. 80.

Amendment of the Court Fees Regulation.

Messrs. (1) S. Krishnaswamy Rao, Linge Gowda and Channappa, Myscre Taluk; (2) C. Subba Rao and P. Venkappaiya, Shimoga District Board and G. M. Kadappa, Shimoga Municipality and (3) K. Subbaraya Chetty, Bowringpet Taluk.

Mr. S. Krishnaswami Rao.—The Court Fees Regulation may be amended so as to allow refund of half the Court fees in case of pauper suits. If the suit is admitted, the admission fee should be reduced by half.

Third Member of Council.—The matter is under the consideration of the Chief Court.

Mr. C. Subba Rao.—If by mistake excess stamps are paid on plaint appeal memo, they are not refunded. Provision may be made for refund in such cases.

Third Member of Council.—The matter will be considered.

Mr. Subbaraya Chetty.—With regard to Court fees, some concession may be shown to plaintiffs in Charitable Endowment suits, just as they show in the case of pauper suits or probate suits, giving at the same time all the advantages of Court fee paid suits.

Third Member of Council.—If a representation is made to Government explaining the hardships, the matter will be considered.

SUBJECT No. 81.

Printing of records in appeals preferred to the Chief Court.

Messrs (1) Channakesava Rao, Koppa Taluk; (2) Sreenivasa Iyengar, Bangalore Law Association; M. Ramachandra Rao Sindhe and K. B. Puttappa, Mysore Chamber of Commerce; (3) S. R. Balakrishna Rao, Shimoga Taluk and (4) B. Sreenivasa Iyengar, Bangalore Law Association.

Mr. Srinivasiengar.—The present practice is that, when the subject matter of the appeal is Rs. 300 and above, the plaint and evidence have to be printed. It is understood that this practice is going to be altered and hereafter all records in all appeal cases should be printed irrespective of the value of the suit. If this is so, the cost of appeal would certainly be very heavy. Even records of cases of the value of Rs. 10 will have to be printed which would be a great hardship. For the purposes of the Judges, copies of material papers can be got by the typewriter without putting the poor parties to unnecessary expense.

Chief Secretary to Government.—No orders are yet passed to that effect.

Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar.—Our information is that the Government are about to issue an order as above. If the information is wrong, we will withdraw the subject.

SUBJECT No. 82.

Non-levy of translation charges in appeals preferred to the Chief Court.

Messrs. (1) B. Srinivasa Iyengar, Bangalore Law Association and (2) S. R. Balakrishna Rao, Shimoga Taluk.

Mr. S. R. Balakrishna Rao.—The matter is worth discussing in the Assembly. There are two points to be discussed. The first is about printing of appeal records. In regard to this matter, there is a proposal before Government as aforesaid although final orders are not yet passed. We have no objection to printing, if the case is complicated and the records are bulky, irrespective of the value of the suit. But in other cases which are comparatively easy, a discretion may be vested in the Registrar of the Chief Court to determine whether the records should be printed or not. In such cases, no limit as to value need be fixed.

The second point is about the translation of records. This is rather a costly affair. The proposal is to levy a fee of 8 annas per sheet of translated matter. There is no need ordinarily to translate any papers. There may be a few papers in Urdu or any other language which needs to be translated. In the case of Kannada records, there should be no translation at all. Till now, the Chief Court Office was submitting papers to the Judges with translations of material papers without any fee from the parties. There is no doubt that the charges will be enormous as there is no limit to translations. The parties should not be burdened with this extra levy which had not been levied hitherto.